

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 94 04:30:07 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #451  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 18 Sep 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 451

Today's Topics:

PRB-1 IGNORED!!!  
Regs Question

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 02:45:19 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-  
nac.CSU.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!stat!david@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: au831@freenet.buffalo.edu (James B. Laughlan Jr)  
Subject: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!  
Message-ID: <Cw7BnK.Gs2@freenet.buffalo.edu>  
Organization: Buffalo Free-Net  
Date:                      Fri, 16 Sep 1994 02:45:19 GMT

On Monday September 12, the town board of Lewiston, N.Y., a small town  
north of Niagara Falls, passed a tower limitation law stating that  
any attached, or freestanding tower erected may not exceed 35 feet in  
height and is limited to one tower per acre. But hams are given the  
privilege of having two towers every 20,000 square feet. Several hams  
including Jim Laughlan N2ETE (yours truly), Brandy Scrufari WB2DNQ,  
Don Burrows K02J Communications officer for the Niagara County R.A.C.E.S.  
attended the public hearing and stated to the board the existence of

FCC document PRB-1 which gives amateur radio stations a complete and total exemption from any tower law. They also stated that the ruling has been successfully defended in both state and federal courts. The response from Councilman Michael Curtis was "ask us for an amendment, don't sue us". Town attorney Edward Jeand that PRB-1 needed to be looked at closer to see if he could recommend the amendment. The board also stated that there was no intention to restrict hams at all and there needed to be a law on the books to protect the town after a recent 3 year battle with a local radio station WTOR which at first proposed to the town to place 3 AM radio towers along Langdon Road in the Town of Lewiston. There was a long battle only to have it settled in N.Y.S. Supreme Court in favor of the radio station, which plans to run 5000 watts directed into Canada after the Canadian D.O.C. denied him a license. As of this time, Attorney for the town Edward Jesella is reviewing PRB-1 to see if any changes could be necessary.

If you wish to copy this to send to any Ham Magazine, ARRL, or FCC, you have my total blessing and permission. Anyone who wishes to leave any advise or messages, may e-mail me at this address.

GOOD LUCK AND GOOD DX 73'S

JIM LAUGHLAN N2ETE

"Don't do anything that I would do!!"

J. Laughlan 10-83

--

-----  
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 19:01:32 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Regs Question  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I seem to remember someone here once saying that the FCC considered bandplans to fall under the "good amateur practice" clause of 97.101. Does anyone know if indeed the FCC holds this view, or what, if anything, they think of bandplans?

Mike, KK6GM

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Sep 1994 05:19:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!

cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cw3u9E.L3E@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <091694185329Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<Cw97vB.6Bz@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>

>>jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>

>>>Dan, please tell us more about Japan's Experimenters License Class,  
>>>such as the limited amount of power output allowed, and about how only  
>>>domestic communications are allowed, and what restricted frequencies one  
>>>can operate on. You'll find that that class of 'license' doesn't provide  
>>>much more than our CB radio service. ^

>

>

>Dan - quit 'speedreading' and instead read every word written-----+  
>'...doesn't provide more more...'. Do you understand my point?

Yes, I missread that. And I understand you point. I appologize for  
the "CBer" comment in the following, I missread what you said.

However see below;

>>Wrong Jeff. As you well know. And calling hams accross the world "CBer"  
>>does nothing to prove your point. Aside from that are you refering to just  
>>the old "class D" CB, or do you count GMRS too?

>

>Apparently you didn't understand my point. The restrictions that  
>accompany Japan's no-code HF license are about the same as with  
>our CB radio service in regards to power, domestic comms, restricted  
>frequencies.

Quoted from a reply to Michael P. Deignan;

From: kawai@Csl.Stanford.EDU (goh kawai - n6uok)  
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 1994 21:01:40 GMT

Michael, you appear to be misinformed. Operations of the Japanese  
no-code license (Class 4 amateur radio operator license) are quite  
different from those of the US CB service, although I'm unsure as to  
which characteristics you perceive as being similar.

First, some facts: Class 4 operators share many HF bands with the rest

of the world. Operation in all modes except CW is allowed. Bands on which Class 4 ops cannot operate are 160, 30, 20, 17 and 12 meters. All VHF/UHF bands are permitted. Output is limited to 10 watts on all bands.

Second, an observation on propagation distance: From Japan to the west coast of the US, 10 watts works remarkably well. From California, I have worked over a thousand JA stations running 10 watts or less. The distance between San Francisco and Tokyo is just about 5,000 miles. This is not considered an unusually long distance; indeed, textbooks for Class 4 license exams clearly (and accurately) state that 10 watts in a reasonable HF antenna can work the world. Many people get their Class 4 licenses because they want to communicate with overseas hams.

Finally, a note on JA ham population: Dan says he thinks Japan has three million hams. To be more accurate, there are just over one and a half million stations currently licensed (JARL statistics, fall 1993). There are over two million individuals who have operator licenses. The reason why the numbers don't match is because station licenses and operator licences are completely distinct, and must be applied for separately. Many people join a club station instead of applying for their personal call sign. Estimates based on license issuance and amateur equipment sales suggest that about ten percent of Class 4 licensees are active on HF.

For your info, I have a Class 2 amateur radio operator license from Japan, and an Amateur Extra license from the US.

	SRI International		work:(415)859-2231
	Speech Technology and Research		fax:(415)859-5984
Goh Kawai	Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493 USA		home:(415)323-7214
	internet: kawai@speech.sri.com		radio: N6UOK and 7L1FQE

----- End Quote -----

On the basis of the above quote, I feel that your comments are a bit thin to say the least regarding the similarities between the two respective services. If in frequency allocation alone. Also in the fact that they are licensed Amateurs, and as such it is legal for US hams to communicate with them (again according to the above post, or not as a US ham would not be violating part 97 in any case THEY might be in violation not the US ham).

>Your problem is that you don't read what you're  
>following up to; you make up things: Show me where I called the  
>world's hams CBers. It's becoming a waste of time to clarify my  
>posts to you.

No Jeff. I was wrong. I missread you and responded in error. It is obviously not a waste of time or I would not have egg all over my face and be appologizing now. I stand corrected. I will try and be more carefull in the future.

Too many times I have seen the vilification of ex-CBers and the use of that term in a derogatory mannor here by pro-code-test advocates. Calling people names and generalizing them like that upsets me, for that I do not appologize. For missreading your post and lashing out at you I do!

You have then Sir; my humble appologies.

Sincerely Yours,

Dan N8PKV

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

-----

Date: Thu, 15 Sep 1994 06:56:42 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3546ee\$kpa@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <1994Sep14.134243.10896@arrl.org>, <357iaj\$cf0@chnews.intel.com>na  
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes

In article <357iaj\$cf0@chnews.intel.com> Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:  
>Hi Ed, let's see if we can collect some clues and use deductive logic to  
>backtrack. Let's assume that "primitive" conditions exist for many hams  
>in the world. An AM transceiver is not \_appreciably\_ more complex than  
>a CW transceiver. Let's say a ballpark figure for hams who prefer phone  
>to CW is 50%. Then I would expect to hear quite a few "primitive" ham  
>conversations taking place using AM... much as it was in the US in the  
>late 1950's when some of us were more "primitive" than others.

Next time I visit Viet Nam I'll ask the locals about this ~50% figure.  
That figure seems to be accurate here in the US but we can't pretend  
our statistics fit the rest of the world.

I believe people will operate with the mode they can both afford and  
and that will insure them a large number of contacts.

CW satisfies both requirements; AM only provides for the former, not  
the latter.

>About the only AM QSO's I hear are on 10m between domestic hams. Therefore,

I hear a couple AM roundtables on 160M in the evenings, and maybe one on 80M. That's certainly not enough to encourage one to build an AM xmtr.

I deleted the rest of your post Cec, but you used the word 'primitive' about 10 times in referring to third-world hams. My best math students are students from very poor countries; they were held to \*very\* high educational standards back home regardless of how economically depressed their country is. Their countrymen are poor but certainly not primitive.

Jeff NH6IL

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #451

\*\*\*\*\*